REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on August 30, 2006 has been carefully reviewed, and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 36-47, 52-60, and 63-64 are currently pending in this application. Claims 36-41 were previously allowed. Claims 48-51 and 61-62 were previously canceled. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the above-captioned application.

Discussion of Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected Claims 42-47, 52-60, and 63-64 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hoffert et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,370,543 B2). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. See M.P.E.P. § 2131. Applicant respectfully submits that Hoffert does not teach a method of video spidering that includes at least the elements of "parsing [an] identified script associated with [a] video," or "executing the parsed script to identify a container file," as recited in independent Claim 42 and as similarly recited in independent Claim 52.

The Examiner asserts that Hoffert discloses the "parsing" feature recited in independent Claims 42 and 52 because "the crawler parses the java script to identify the video content," and further because "each new page which is parsed is searched for media file references." Applicant respectfully submits that no such parsing is shown in Hoffert.

Hoffert discloses a crawler which locates media files by scanning HTML pages for predetermined types of HTML tags (col. 4, lines 22-23). While these predetermined types of tags may include Java script tags (col. 4, line 28), Applicant respectfully submits that scanning HTML code for Java script tags is very different from parsing the Java script itself. To the extent that Hoffert does show parsing, the parsing is only of HTML code and its embedded tags, and not of any script (see col. 3 lines 27-30). Thus, the "parsing" feature of the claimed invention is not found or described in Hoffert.

The Examiner also asserts that Hoffert discloses "executing the parsed script to identify a container file," as recited in independent Claim 42, because "in order to identify video or media, the java script needs to be executed." Applicant respectfully submits that a Java script

need not be executed in order to identify a video or media file. Rather, as taught by Hoffert, a video file may be identified by merely scanning for predetermined types of tags in the HTML code (col. 4, lines 22-23). As a result, in addition to lacking the feature of a parsed script, Hoffert further fails to disclose the recited feature of "executing the parsed script to identify a container file."

Similarly, the Examiner asserts that Hoffert discloses "executing the parsed script to identify content," as recited in independent Claim 52. As best understood by Applicant, the Examiner alleges that the crawler in the patented device scans web sites for pages containing media references, and assigns those pages a higher priority for processing (col. 3, lines 25-51). Applicant submits, however, that Hoffert describes only content identification by scanning *HTML code* for predetermined tags, and not by "executing [a] parsed script." Applicant further submits that a prioritization system for pages containing media references in no way shows "executing [a] parsed script to identify content." Thus, Hoffert fails to disclose the recited feature of "executing the parsed script to identify content." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that since Hoffert does not teach or suggest each and every element of independent Claims 42 and 52, these Claims are not anticipated and are in condition for allowance.

Claims 43-47, 53-60, and 63-64 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 42 and 52, and thus are patentable for at least the same reasons that the claims from which they depend are patentable over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 42-47, 52-60, and 63-64.

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. In light of the above remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions which may be answered by telephone, he is invited to call the undersigned directly.

CONCLUSION

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: _____11/29/06_____

By: _____
John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

AMEND

3153563
112806